

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Subgroup
History Record

FAA Control # 99-02-220

SUBJECT: Use of RVR Mimima

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: The FAA position, with which ALPA agrees, is that RVR is not visibility. Rather, it is a measurement only of the ability to see the HIRLs when on the runway surface in the TDZ. As a practical matter, when the controlling minimum is predicated on RVR, and when the prevailing visibility is less than the visibility equivalent of RVR, the pilot decision whether to continue descent for landing at DH or MDA is predicated solely on the sighting of ALS, then HIRL. In these conditions, the flight visibility conditions are often so minimal that the pilot is unable to sight any object in the visual segment of the approach flight path, other than ALS or HIRLs. Where penetrations of visual segment surfaces require an adjustment upwards of the visibility or RVR minimum, it is based on the premise that the higher minimum will enable the pilot to sight the penetrating obstacle(s). This premise is logical when prevailing visibility is the controlling minimum, but is illogical and potentially unsafe when the controlling minimum is RVR.

RECOMMENDATION: RVR should be denied as the controlling minimum where penetrations of a runway's visual surfaces exist.

COMMENTS: This affects FAA Handbooks 8260.3, "TERPS" and 8260.19 "Flight Procedures and Airspace".

Submitted by: Captain Simon Lawrence, Chairman
Charting and Instrument Procedures Committee

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION

PH: (703) 689-4176 FAX: (703) 689-4370 March 10, 2000

INITIAL DISCUSSION (Meeting 99-02): Wally Roberts presented this issue on behalf of ALPA. They are concerned that the use of RVR as the sole means for determining minimums for an approach when the prevailing visibility is less than the RVR equivalent could present safety problems. This is especially true when there are penetrations of the visual segment surfaces that require an upward adjustment of visibility minimums to allow pilots to see and avoid obstructions. ALPA's position is that that RVR be denied as the controlling minimum when there are penetrations of a runways visual surfaces. Dave Eckles, AFS-420 agreed to take the issue for study. **Action: AFS-420.**

MEETING 00-01: Dave Eckles, AFS-420, presented a status update paper on the issue prepared by Jim Nixon, AFS-420. It is the AFS-420 position that this issue is not germane to the ACF. It is recommended that ALPA address this issue to the Aviation Rules and Advisory Committee (ARAC). Simon Lawrence, ALPA, asked which ARAC, as there are several. As the co-chair was not familiar with ARAC makeup or procedures, it was agreed to defer discussion on this issue to the next meeting. Bill Hammett requested that this issue be combined with Issue 98-01-199 and addressed by AFS-410. Simon agreed. Howard Swancy, AFS-4, was requested to provide a copy of ALPA's original issue paper to AFS-410 and request they work the issue in conjunction with issue 98-01-199. **Issue Closed** (to be addressed by **AFS-410** in conjunction with 98-01-199.
